



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/787,108	02/27/2004	Tatsuhiko Miyata	NIT-415	5068	
86636	7590	08/10/2011			
BRUNDIDGE & STANGER, P.C.				EXAMINER	
2318 MILL ROAD, SUITE 1020				WANG, HARRIS C	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
		2439			
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
		08/10/2011	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/787,108	Applicant(s) MIYATA ET AL.
	Examiner HARRIS WANG	Art Unit 2439

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2011.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 30 and 31 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 30 and 31 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-442)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 30-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Gavrilin in view of AAPA.

Regarding Claim 30,

Chang (20030229623) teaches a server for communicating with a plurality of user terminals via a communication network, comprising:

A memory unit (Figure 4)

A network interface connected to said communication network (*Paragraph [0077]*

"the method may alternatively be implemented in conjunction with other suitable web server software");

a Controller, connected to said memory unit and said network interface, for controlling access operations requested to one of said first and second object information items based on said hierarchical access permission setting values, received through said network interface so as to rewrite access permission values of access operations each having a priority level equal to or higher than that of said specific access operation into the permission state for specific second object information item and at least one of said first and second object information items each having a hierarchical relation with the specific second object information item and having permission priority higher than that of the specific second object information item in said layered structure and to rewrite access permission values of access operations each having a priority level equal to or lower than that of said specific access operation into the non-permissions state for said specific second object information item and the other second information items each having a hierarchical relation with the specific second object information item and having permission priority lower than that of the specific second object information item

(“In the IBM JMS implementations the types of user permissions include “+pub”, “+sub”, “persist”,...where a plus symbol means granting a permission and a minus symbol means denying a permission. Permission may be assigned to all users, i.e. “public” or to a specific user. This scheme supports permission inheritance for both positive (granting) and negative (denying) permission” Paragraph [0035])(“In Figure 8b, “reverse” or “upward” inheritance is illustrated, such that employed for the JMS Topic hierarchy, wherein a subscriber at a certain level receives subscriber abilities at all “higher” levels in the tree (e.g. for all ancestor or parent

levels" Paragraph [0116]. The Examiner considers the normal and reverse inheritance described by Chang as rewriting access permissions to those having a permission priority higher and lower than the granting or denying of a privilege ;

Chang does not explicitly teach wherein said controller operates in response to a request for changing the access permission setting value of a specific one of said access operations for a specific one of said second object information items from a non-permission state to a permission state, wherein said controller operates, in response to a request for changing the access permission setting value of said specific one of said access operations from the permission state to the non-permission state received through said network interface

Gavilla teaches in response to a request for changing the access permission setting value of a specific one of said access operations for a specific one of said second object information items from a non-permission state to a permission state, wherein said controller operates, in response to a request for changing the access permission setting value of said specific one of said access operations from the permission state to the non-permission state received through said network interface ("comprise automatic revocation and recalculation of permissions on object instance for role instances whenever...a permission is revoked from a role" Paragraph [0027])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the normal and reverse inheritance model of Chang to include automatically propagating changes to inheritances as taught by Gavilla

The motivation is to allow dynamic inheritance.

Chang and Gavrila still do not explicitly teach storing a first object information item including identification information of one of said user terminals, a plurality of second object information items including plural kinds of attribute information relating to the user terminal or a user of the user terminal, and hierarchical access permission setting values corresponding to a plurality of access operations having different priority levels and predefined for each of said first and second object information items said first and second object information items being stored in association with vertical relation information to form a layered object structure for categorizing said second object information items in hierarchical relation and indicating that first object information has the highest permission priority and each of said second object information items has higher permission priority than that for the other second object information items at a lower position in the layered object structure

AAPA teaches storing a first object information item including identification information of one of said user terminals, a plurality of second object information items including plural kinds of attribute information relating to the user terminal or a user of the user terminal, and hierarchical access permission setting values corresponding to a plurality of access operations having different priority levels and predefined for each of said first and second object information items (*Figure 27 and Background of the invention teaches a first object information including identification information (see User A) and a plurality of second object information items including plurality kinds of attribute information relating to the user terminal (See related permissions for files A, B, C) hierarchical access permission setting values*

having different priority levels (See different permissions for owner, group and others wherein there is a hierarchy amongst the three),

said first and second object information items being stored in association with vertical relation information to form a layered object structure for categorizing said second object information items in hierarchical relation and indicating that first object information has the highest permission priority and each of said second object information items has higher permission priority than that for the other second object information items at a lower position in the layered object structure (*Figure 27 shows a hierarchical relation with the files wherein the user is in a "higher layer" than the files*);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the layered file structure system as taught by AAPA

The motivation is to provide an organized hierarchy

Regarding Claim 31,

Chang, Gavrila and AAPA teach the server according to claim 30, wherein said access operations include an information disclosure operation an information read operation and an information write operation, wherein the information disclosure has priority higher than read which has higher than write (Figure 27 of AAPA execution is disclosure, read is read, write is write)

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HARRIS WANG whose telephone number is (571)270-1462. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, EDAN ORGAD can be reached on (571) 272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Harris C Wang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2439

/Edan Orgad/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2439